

Westlake Cycle Track Design Advisory Committee

Meeting #3 Summary

Monday, April 21, 2014 5:30-8:00 p.m.

MOHAI – Norcliffe Conference Room

Design Advisory Committee Member Attendees

Member Name	Interest Represented	Attendance
Warren Aakervik	Freight interests	Present
Martha Aldridge	Lake Union Park users	Present
Andrew Austin	Non-vehicular commuters	Absent
Devor Barton	Pedestrian interests	Present
Karen Braitmayer	Westlake Ave North business owners	Present
Dave Chappelle	Lake Union floating home and live-aboard residents	Present
Thomas Goldstein	Cascade Bicycle Club	Present
Amalia Leighton	Transportation Engineer	Present
Sarah McGray	Bicycle interests	Present
John Meyer	Air/water transportation/tourism	Present
Martin Nelson	Westlake Stakeholders Group*	Present
Peter Schrappen	Lake Union marina operators and boat moorage tenants	Present
Cam Strong	Westlake Stakeholders Group*	Present

**Note: The Westlake Stakeholders Group represents a variety of businesses and residents within the Westlake corridor.*

Staff attendees

Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)

- Barbara Lee
- Art Brochet
- Mike Estey
- Mary Rutherford
- Dawn Shellenberg
- Sam Woods

Mayor's Office

- Andrew Glass Hastings

EnviroIssues

- Penny Mabie
- David Gitlin
- Sara Colling

Toole Design Group

- Kristen Lohse

- Kenneth Loen
- Gina Coffman

Observers

- Adam Blumenthal
- Andrea Tousignant
- Ann Bassetti
- Arden Wilken
- Arne Levang
- Barbara Stein
- Bill Wehrenberg
- Bill Wiginton
- Bjorn Wahl
- Brock Gilman
- Brock Howell
- Carl Tully
- Carlos Inclan

- Cathy Graubert
- Christian Roth
- Demi Allen
- Dia Thibadean
- Dick Schwartz
- Doug McElroy
- Drew Dresman
- Eric Westberg
- Greg Welsh
- Jack Wilken
- Jake Caouette
- Jerry Dinndorf
- Jesse Nelson
- Jo Hull
- John Hull
- John Liberty
- Kevin Carrabine
- LeAnn Byrum
- Lynn Asbeck
- Lynne Reister
- Margaret Moore
- Marilyn Perry
- Marty Greer
- Matt Robesch
- Max Taran
- McKayla Dunfy
- Millie Magner
- Pamela Hale
- Pat Tucker
- Paul Wirsing
- Phil Baumon
- Phillip Singer
- Richard Hule
- Richard Monroe
- Robert Elleman
- Ross Leventhal
- Sean Cryan
- Sonia McBride
- Spencer Byrum
- Suzanne Dills
- Tanya Lamp
- Ted Quanstrom
- Teresa Monahan

- Tim Gould
- Tim O'Conner
- Deb Otto
- Tom Fucoloro
- Tom Monahan
- Verouique Wahl
- Zach Stednek

Note: This document is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It is not intended to be a transcription of the meeting, but an overview of points raised and responses from SDOT and Design Advisory Committee (DAC) members.

Welcome and introductions

Penny Mabie, facilitator, welcomed the Design Advisory Committee (DAC) and audience members and led a round of introductions. She reviewed the meeting agenda:

1. Adopt summary from Meeting #2
2. DAC members share feedback from the interests they represent
3. Overview of alignment concepts
4. DAC members ask clarifying questions
5. Discuss May 21 open house
6. Observer comments to DAC

Review of Meeting #2 summary

Penny called the DAC members' attention to the meeting #2 summary included in their packets. She asked if the members agreed to adopt the summary.

- Peter Schrappen, Lake Union marina operators and boat moorage tenants, noted that the summary reflects that fire zones were included in the parking count but he didn't think that was the case.
 - o Kristen Lohse, Toole Design Group, clarified she may have misunderstood. She meant to say fire zones were considered in their analysis, not that they were included in the parking count.
 - o Peter agreed with keeping the summary as is.
- Cam Strong, Westlake Stakeholders Group, noted he had not had time to review the meeting summary to see if his request for responses to his emailed comments on the memos provided for meeting #2 and therefore did not feel he could approve the summary at that time.
 - o Penny agreed to wait to approve the summary until later in the meeting.

DAC members share feedback from the interests they represent

Penny asked committee members to share the input they've been receiving from their constituents.

- Karen Braitmayer, Westlake Ave North business owners, reported that she's been out of town recently but she has heard from neighbors who are concerned about parking.
- Sarah McGray, Bicycle interests, reported hearing concerns about sightlines particularly with cars and pedestrians crossing the cycle track.
- Martin Nelson, Westlake Stakeholders Group, reported hearing concerns about viability of marine-related businesses.

- Peter reported communicating with Representative Gael Tarleton. He brought printed letters of her response demonstrating concern for the impact on businesses.
- Devor Barton, Pedestrian interests, reported hearing about the importance of constructing a cycle track that addresses parking and traffic.
- Dave Chappelle, Lake Union floating home and live-aboard residents, reported the average length of time that floating home residents live on Westlake is 22 years, though they don't feel they've been asked to the table. They're also concerned this committee won't have a viable impact on the outcome.
- Warren Aakervik, Freight interests, reported the freight community is concerned with traffic on Westlake, cars turning on and off Westlake, as well as cars backing out of parking spaces.
- Cam reported he is hearing concerns about parking and the impact on the community. Moorage tenants are considering moving elsewhere due to lack of parking and a survey targeted at moorage tenants has not been conducted as discussed with SDOT. There is also concern that the City is not planning adequately for future projects.
- John Meyer, Air/water transportation/tourism, reported he has friends who bike the corridor who are skeptical this corridor can be made safer with a cycle track.
- Thomas Goldstein, Cascade Bicycle Club, reported he hears that people care about safety for pedestrians and cyclists as well as economic vitality in the corridor. He noted the built environment can lead to safety.
- Martha Aldridge, Lake Union Park users, reported she hears some concerns about getting school busses in and out safely during construction.
- Amalia Leighton, Transportation Engineer, reported people are excited to see the results of this process and how this can be applied to other projects in the City.

Presentation: Overview of alignment concepts

Barbara Lee, SDOT Project Manager, introduced the presentation with SDOT's vision and mission. She also reviewed the project goals:

- **Safety** for all users
- **Connectivity:** Connect cycle track with surrounding bike/walking trails and facilities
- **Accessibility:** Provide a flat, low-stress bike path, making this scenic corridor more accessible to residents and visitors

Kristen Lohse, Toole Design Group, then reviewed the design guidelines:

- 10 feet minimum plus 2-foot separation
- Two-way operation
- Design speed of 10 mph
- Special crossing treatments
- Maximize parking

Kristen outlined some of the design history, noting that at the October 2013 open house SDOT presented four potential alignment concepts, including Westlake Avenue North. However, after further study, a cycle track on Westlake Avenue North is not a feasible option because it requires removal of a travel lane or acquiring additional right-of-way, requires significant construction, and is outside project scope and budget. SDOT is now presenting two concepts to the DAC for their input.

Kenneth Loen, Toole Design Group, then outlined the primary features of the two design concepts:

- **Concept A** is on the west side of the parking lot. It revises the traffic flow to one-way circulation. Some landscape and trees would be removed and there are multiple street and driveway crossings. It could involve driveway consolidation. The service lane would remain intact.
- **Concept B** is on the east side of the parking lot. It would use the service lane in parts and therefore has less of an impact on parking supply. It also revises the traffic flow to one-way circulation. Landscaping and the east sidewalk would be reduced in some sections. It would involve fewer driveway crossings.

DAC member clarifying questions

- Sarah asked if the minimum width of the sidewalk is 8 feet.
 - o Kenneth responded that 8 feet is the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standard but not a fixed width.
 - o Amalia added that the city standard is 6 feet.
- John said he is concerned with Concept A in terms of safety for all ages. He asked how they could reconcile the road cuts in design.
 - o Kenneth agreed that is a primary safety concern that would be worked out in future design.
- Martin noted that in Concept B every customer would have to cross the cycle track to get to businesses and back. He asked if the design team has ideas for how pedestrian circulation can be addressed.
 - o Kristen responded they have ideas for how that can be addressed. For example, Toole is looking at where businesses share entrances.
- Martin noted there are may be 1,800 vehicles crossing Concept A each day and asked if the design team has addressed those crossings.
 - o Kristen said traffic would be dispersed across driveways but agreed they would need to design the cycle track to address those crossings.
- Martin noted both concepts are exclusively within the parking area. He asked if SDOT has looked at other alternatives such as a raised track or a track along the west side of Westlake.
 - o Barbara responded a raised track would introduce major issues such as getting people on and off the track and it doesn't meet the project purpose and need of providing safety and a cycle track for all ages and abilities. The roadway option similarly doesn't meet the goal of attracting users not comfortable with riding bikes next to cars.

- Cam asked if there would be further study on traffic flows in the corridor. He noted his concern with revising traffic flow to be one-way in the parking lot.
 - o Kristen said Toole has the information it needs.
- Cam expressed a concern with high-speed bicyclists using this corridor and asked if high-speed bicyclists will be prohibited from riding on the track and in the parking lot.
 - o Kristen said high-speed bicyclists wouldn't be prohibited but the cycle track will be more attractive for those going at slower speeds.
 - o Cam noted that wouldn't be solving the safety problem.
- Devor asked, regarding Concept B, how pedestrians currently cross the service lane.
 - o Kristen responded they cross the service lane at a generally low volume and the vehicles generally yield to the pedestrians.
- Sarah asked if the design team considered two one-way tracks. She noted not all cycle tracks have a two-foot buffer
 - o Kenneth responded that would entail slightly more impact to parking. He noted Concepts A and B are bookends and the final design could end up in between. He added that by definition, cycle tracks have some sort of physical protection from cars.
- Peter asked, in regards to SDOT's goals, how a cycle track supports a thriving economy on Westlake.
 - o Barbara responded that the project is not only about the corridor. It is about the City's network and need to bring commuters and tourists through the corridor.
 - o Devor added that the cycle track will get bicyclists to and from businesses.
 - o Thomas added that other cities have conducted studies on cycle tracks. Venice, California is an example of a city that added cycle tracks in commercial centers with high pedestrian counts that have been working well. He noted that people are driving less and economic vitality demands that people have a way to get to businesses by bicycle.
- Dave noted the evaluation criteria on the handout and asked when the design would address the issues around safety.
 - o Kristen said today the DAC members would be able to look at the roll plots.
 - o Dave asked if they are that far along in design.
 - o Barbara reiterated both concepts A and B are high level concepts. There is a lot that still needs to be worked out and part of the purpose of this meeting is to identify key elements to consider in design.
- Warren asked if the cycle track would be protected from pedestrians as well as vehicles, with defined crossings.
 - o Kenneth said there would be distinction between bikes and pedestrians with defined crossings.
- Martin commented that other options have been dismissed as too expensive and asked if there are studies on what effect the cycle tracks have on businesses. He noted that putting in more money up front could save money in the long term.
 - o Penny clarified that Martin was asking if there has been an economic impact study.

- Kristen replied no.
- Peter asked if there are trends on collisions and injuries within the corridor, noting he understands they are underreported.
 - Kristen responded they have collision data but only for collisions between bikes and vehicles.

Penny wrapped up the clarifying Q&A portion and explained that staff will display multiple roll plots illustrating Concepts A and B around the room. Both DAC members and the audience would have a chance to view the alignment concepts during the break.

DAC members discuss alignment concepts

Noting figures displayed on the roll plot, Barbara reiterated that percentages of parking loss are higher in Concept A because Concept A, along the west side of the parking lot, does not touch the service road. She noted that the DAC and design team can explore using the service lane within Concept A in order to maximize parking.

Penny asked the DAC members to do a round robin where they share what is top of mind after seeing the two design concepts.

- Amalia said regarding Concept A, she is concerned with the 35 mph posted speed limit on Westlake Ave N and turning movements into driveways. It also reduces more parking. Regarding Concept B, it would be nice to have the pedestrians and bicyclists along the same corridor and there are jogs that would help control speed. In the northern part of Concept B, by driveway 14, there are two crossings which hopefully could be addressed.
- Martha said she would prefer the cycle track in the space closer to Concept A because bikes would cross with just cars rather than both cars and pedestrians.
- Thomas noted he is leaning toward Concept B because of safety as well as preserving as much parking as possible. Concept B is more in line with enhancing quality of life for all users.
- John agreed that he prefers Concept B because of safety. He thought Concept B seems to make more sense for cars and bikes but he's not sure how to integrate that with pedestrians. Concept B also raises issues for freight traffic because of load zones.
- Cam noted one-way parking raises questions and concerns about flow of traffic onto Westlake. He also noted concerns about Concept B because customers and deliveries would have to cross the cycle track.
- Warren noted it could be useful to have one-way travel in various places within the parking lot, rather than throughout the entire parking lot. He said signalization would allow for controlled turning onto Westlake. He noted he is more inclined toward Concept B because it allows for parking and turning on Concept A seems unsafe.
- Dave said he sees Concept A as a non-starter because of safety. He sees some advantage with Concept B over Concept A but is concerned with the loss of parking.

- Devor said Concept A has better defined mixing zones but has many stops for bicyclists. Concept B is less clear with pedestrians crossing the track. He asked how bicyclists exit the track to reach businesses.
- Peter agreed with Dave and said he is not convinced the two concepts address safety.
- Martin said Concept A would hurt marine-related businesses while Concept B would put pedestrians and bicyclists next to one another and would require anyone trying to get to businesses to cross the cycle track. He doesn't know how that could be done safely. He would prefer a Concept C with the cycle track placed along the west side of Westlake Ave North using the sidewalk.
- Sarah said the goal is to encourage predictable behavior for all uses. Concept B is inherently safer but neither encourages predictable behavior. She would want to explore splitting the directionality of the track.
- Karen said she was disappointed to see the amount of proposed parking loss. She does see value in part of Concept B. Pedestrians are often crossing bike traffic in current conditions, so having bikes adjacent to the sidewalk is safer for pedestrians because they would have sightlines. She also sees the value in having bicyclists away from the road and closer to the lake. She wonders if a signalized track is a possibility.

Penny offered a high level summary of the DAC members' initial responses: Concept A has some advantages but needs to address safety; Concept B has a few more advantages than Concept A but there needs to be more detail provided.

- Thomas added that Concept B has some questions and issues that need to be addressed. He cautioned against getting into a "Concept C" conversation that is out of the scope of the committee.
- John asked which side of the sidewalk the cycle track would be on in Concept B.
 - o Kristen responded as you're looking north, the track would be to the left of the sidewalk.
 - o Martin asked about the impact of Concept B on freight.
 - Kristen responded that would need to be considered.
- Warren noted that bikes go where they want to go.
 - o Sarah disagreed, stating that 99 percent of bicyclists go where they're told to go. When there is no clear direction, bikes do the wrong thing. When there is clear direction, most bicyclists will follow the rules.

Penny encouraged the DAC members to spend about 15 minutes in their own discussion between each other.

- Amalia asked about how freight, in terms of deliveries, crosses the sidewalk now.
 - o Martin said that on the south end there isn't an issue because the pedestrians aren't traveling at fast speeds.
 - o Thomas said there is cycle traffic there currently.

- Martin said there isn't enough traffic for it to be a problem.
 - Cam added that there are fuel trucks at Nautical Landing and marine-related repair shops that bring boats off trailers and require machinery.
 - Dave added that they use curb cuts to get across.
- John asked if there are examples of Concept B working anywhere else.
 - Thomas said he would be happy to ask the experts and get back to the committee.
 - Amalia added there are examples of bike facilities integrating with commercial loading.
- Cam noted off-loading fuel can take six hours with a large hose stretching across the parking lot.
 - Devor asked how that works currently with pedestrian traffic, particularly those who can't step over the hose.
 - Cam said pedestrians and bicyclists go around the truck.
- Sarah noted that the committee seems to be expecting that whatever they design would never be violated. Currently there are issues and it's not realistic to design the cycle track to not encounter any challenges.
 - Dave said that was a good statement and he doesn't think anyone is expecting to meet all goals but he's willing to spend the time and hopefully the City is willing to spend the money to do this correctly.
 - Sarah said that was fair but didn't want the group to get off track.
 - Thomas said he agrees with Dave. The members are there to lend their expertise. This is personal for all the members. There are examples where this has been done well particularly in Chicago.
- Warren said he doesn't understand the vision of what this looks like.
 - Thomas said demand is increasing but this is early in design so it's not defined yet how this would look.
- Penny reminded the group that these designs are just a starting point. She asked the DAC what they are thinking about this overall and how could it improve.
 - Martha said design can change behavior significantly. The committee should think about how obstacles can be managed with behavior change.
- Peter said while he values information from other areas, this waterfront is unique and businesses need access.
- Martin said he knows SDOT eliminated the west side of Westlake but from a safety point of view, there are fewer crossings and there would be less economic impact on the corridor. The upfront money would save money in the long run.
 - Amalia asked if Martin is proposing leaving all four lanes of traffic on Westlake Avenue North.
 - Martin responded the sidewalk could be used as a lane for cars.
- Amalia responded to Peter's comment that there are industrial areas in Seattle and other similar situations in Seattle and around the country that the committee can draw from.
 - Peter noted that marine-related businesses can't just move anywhere.
 - Amalie agreed, but noted that industrial businesses within other examples can't either.

- Martha said there could be some advantages in bringing bikes closer to the businesses.
 - o Cam asked Martha if she could think about potential replacement parking.
- Devor returned to Martin's idea about removing the sidewalk on the eastside of Westlake Avenue North, noting that people would still need access to the bus stops on Westlake.
 - o Karen agreed, adding that those stops are currently utilized.

Discuss May 21 open house

Penny reminded the committee their next meeting will be June 9th and before that is the community open house on May 21st. She asked the DAC members what should be included in the open house.

- Martin asked what SDOT is going to present to the public, still being in the discussion phase.
- Art Brochet, SDOT Communications Lead, explained the purpose of the open house is to share findings from the studies as well as the alignment concepts the members saw today. He asked the committee how they would see themselves engaging with the public.
- Martin said he would like SDOT to present to the committee what they are going to present to the public.
 - o Penny responded they would share what has been presented to this committee.
- Dave said he thinks now is a good time for an open house. They don't have a finished product but the public is asking to be involved. It could be a good opportunity for a charette or an open Q&A.
- Thomas said it would be helpful to have one more meeting between now and the public hearing. He would like to hear responses on questions such as Sarah's idea for separating the track directions and Warren's idea of splitting traffic directions.
- Cam agreed with Thomas. The committee still has a lot of questions. He wants to know what SDOT is going to present and doesn't want to hear that SDOT has games with dots that lead to a conclusion.
- Martha noted that there has to be a balance. If design goes too far, the community will wonder why they are giving input.
- Karen said she has concerns about presenting these ideas to the public. It would be challenging for the public to see this at a high level without the same chance to ask questions. She noted she would be uncomfortable representing these concepts when she still has many questions.
- Devor asked what SDOT's expectation is for the open house.
 - o Penny said the expectation is to share where the concepts are to date before decisions are made. The expectation of the committee is to be at the open house and to speak to what they have learned.
 - o Art added at this point SDOT wants the DAC to hear from the general public as well. SDOT expects that between this meeting and the open house, they can develop the alignment concepts further, based on committee input, and present them to the committee. It is important that the public is involved early so SDOT wants to share information before alignment concepts develop too much further.
 - Devor asked what the DAC member role would be during the open house.

- Art responded that the open house would likely have a series of stations for people to ask questions and there may be a presentation. DAC members could help orient people and answer questions.
- Penny said she is hearing that the DAC members want more information and detail, not to advance the design, but to feel comfortable answering questions at the open house.
 - Amalia disagreed. She said there are currently two high-level concepts and the final design will likely be in-between the two. It would be valuable to get input from the public at this point to know if they have the same responses to the design as the DAC members.
- Thomas said he sees value in meeting again before the open house to answer a few high level questions and maybe include an hour of public comment.
 - Amalia responded the purpose of the open house would be to receive public comment. It would allow more time and more people to provide feedback.
 - Penny asked if the additional DAC meeting would preclude that from happening at the open house.
 - Amalia said she would be concerned if it changes the date of the open house. She would want to know what questions the committee is asking SDOT to answer.
- Martin asked where the open house will be.
 - Art answered it will be at the Fremont Studios on 35th Street, just west of Phinney Ave.
- Cam asked if there would be a survey targeted at marina customers.
 - Penny suggested taking that conversation offline.

Observer Comments to DAC

Penny addressed the audience letting them know she would have to limit public comment to five minutes because of time constraints.

- Comment 1 – A resident on the north end of Westlake who also repairs boats on Westlake commented that any reduction in parking would equal reduction in marine usage. Taking the spaces away means the slips become unusable.
- Comment 2 – A resident on Westlake corrected a comment she made at a previous meeting that there are 411 bike trips per day. That is actually per number of hours not per day. She added this process feels like the community's input won't have an effective change.
- Comment 3 – Comment that he wants more information from the design team on which mode of transportation yields to which.
- Comment 4 – Comment from a floating home resident thanking the DAC for their work. She asked whether more than Concepts A and B would be presented, as well as the comments from the DAC written on the flip chart.
- Comment 5 – Comment from a resident who lives on their sailboat who had a design drawn that uses the center of the roadway. It would save parking and offer a solution to the disparity of speed issue.

- Comment 6 – A 25-year Seattle resident and cyclist commented that Concept B has a greater level of safety because of the separation from cars and increased sightline visibility. He encouraged the DAC to continue and look beyond entrenchments of opinion. He has seen the examples in Chicago and he hopes this will help Seattle to become a more livable, desirable city.
- Comment 7 – Comment expressing concerns that the City is putting a cycle track in the middle of a viable community without warning or an economic study.
- Comment 8 – Comment that controlled intersections are the safest way to control the mix. Where there are stop lights, Concept A is safer. Concept B would eliminate operations as the drive through Starbucks.

Next Steps

Penny wrapped up the meeting noting that the project team will be in touch with DAC members about scheduling an additional meeting. They will not advance the design but will answer questions.

The community open house will be on May 21st at Fremont Studios from 5:30-8 p.m.